APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/864,655	05/24/2001	Brien M. Oberstein	4195-4002	3828

7590	10/18/2005

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
345 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10154-0053

EXAMINER
PHILLIPS, HASSAN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2151	

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/864,655	OBERSTEIN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hassan Phillips	2151	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 August 2005</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>236-241,243-292, 294-299, 301-350, 352-357 and 359-429</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>236-241,243-292, 294-299, 301-350, 352-357 and 359-429</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to communications filed August 8, 2005.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on August 8, 2005 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 412 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

5. Claim 412 recites the limitation "said well-defined event" in the second line on page 26 of the amended claims. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

6. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

7. Claims 410 and 411 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed

invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. A "computer program" is not a

useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 236, 262, 294, 320, 352, 378,

410-412, and dependent claims depending therefrom have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102

that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

10. Claims 236, 262, 294, 320, 352, 378, 410-412, are rejected under 35
U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Motoyama et al. (hereinafter Motoyama), U.S.
Patent 6,581,092.

11. In considering claims 236, 294, 352, and 410, Motoyama teaches a method,
apparatus, and computer readable medium having computer executable instructions for
facilitating event communication among networks having a plurality of systems,
comprising: receiving at least one event in a client (272, 301, 542), said event
transmitted by an event generating entity (278, 300, 544) coupled thereto, (col. 10, lines
15-25, col. 11, lines 41-48, col. 14, lines 14-57); converting said event in said client to a
well-defined event, (col. 11, lines 41-48, col. 16, line 46-col. 17, line 32); determining a
priority for said well-defined event, (col. 16, line 46-col. 17, line 32); obtaining at least
one event handling script associated with said well-defined event, (col. 14, lines 34-57,
col. 16, line 46-col. 17, line 8); and processing said well-defined event in accordance
with said event handling script, (col. 14, lines 34-57, col. 16, line 46-col. 17, line 8).

12. In considering claims 262, 320, 378, and 411, Motoyama teaches a method,
apparatus, and computer readable medium having computer executable instructions for
facilitating event communication among networks having a plurality of systems,
comprising: receiving at least one well-defined event at a server (254, 502) wherein said
well-defined event is forwarded to said server from a client (272, 301, 542) coupled
thereto, (col. 9, lines 35-43, col. 14, line 14-col. 15, line 40); determining a priority for

said well-defined event, (col. 16, line 46-col. 17, line 32); obtaining at least one event

handling script associated with said well-defined event, (col. 14, lines 34-57; col. 16, line

46-col. 17, line 8); and processing said well-defined event in accordance with said event

handling script, (col. 14, lines 34-57, col. 16, line 46-col. 17, line 8).

13. In considering claim 412, Motoyama teaches a system for facilitating event

communication among networks having a plurality of systems, comprising: a server with

a work flow manager for determining a priority for a well-defined event, (col. 16, line 46-

col. 17, line 32); said well-defined event is forwarded to said server from a plurality of

networks coupled thereto, (col. 9, lines 35-43, col. 14, line 14-col. 15, line 40, also see

Fig's 5 and 11); an agent resident on one of said plurality of networks, wherein said

agent communicates with said server, (col. 9, lines 35-43, col. 14, line 14-col. 15, line

40); and a monitor coupled to said agent, wherein said monitor handles and displays

notifications and enables event handling in said agent, wherein said server further acts

as a message router for forwarding well-defined events between one or more agents,

said agent providing said server with connectivity information, said server further

persisting well-defined events and well-defined event actions that flow through said

system, (col. 8, lines 46-62, col. 9, lines 35-43, col. 14, line 14-col. 15, line 40, col. 16,

line 46-col. 17, line 32).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. Claims 236-241, 243-292, 294-299, 301-350, 352-357, 359-429 are rejected

under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coley et al. (hereinafter Coley),

U.S. Patent 5,751,914 (see Applicants IDS), in view of Kung, U.S. Patent 5,159,685,

and further in view of Touboul, U.S. Patent 6,658,465.

16. In considering claims 236, 262, 294, 320, 352, 378, 410, and 411, Coley

teaches a method, system, apparatus and computer readable medium having computer

executable instructions for facilitating event communication among networks having a

plurality of systems comprising: Receiving at least one event in a client or server, the

event transmitted by an event-generating entity coupled thereto, obtaining at least one

event handling script associated with the event, and, processing the event in

accordance with the event handling script, (col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9,

lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56; also see Fig. 1).

Although the teachings of Coley show substantial features of the claimed

invention, they fail to expressly disclose: determining a priority for a received event.

Nevertheless, Coley does teach correlating a plurality of events within a data processing system that evaluates the plurality of events with respect to a predetermined rule to determine an action to be performed, (col. 2, lines 2-9). Furthermore, determining a priority for a received event was well known in the art at the time of the present invention. This is exemplified in the teachings of Kung. In a similar field of endeavor Kung teaches an expert system for a communications network comprising: determining a priority for a received event, (col. 4, line 60 through col. 5, line 2).

Thus, if not implicit in the teachings of Coley, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to modify the teachings of Coley to show determining a priority for a received event. Doing so would have ensured an efficient means for handling received events in an order of importance, Coley, col. 4, line 60 through col. 5, line 2.

Although the modified teachings of Coley show substantial features of the claimed invention, they further fail to expressly disclose: converting the event in the client to a well-defined event, or receiving the well-defined event from the client.

Nevertheless, Coley does teach converting the event in a server to a well-defined event, (col. 4, lines 31-33, col. 8, lines 32-36). Furthermore, it was well known in the art at the time of the present invention that a server could also function as a client, and functionality found in a server could also be implemented in a client. In a similar field of endeavor, Touboul teaches a method and apparatus for monitoring and controlling programs in a network comprising: converting an event in a client (14) to a well-defined

event, and receiving the event in a management console from the client, (col. 4, lines 49-67, also see Fig. 1).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to further modify the teachings of Coley to show converting the event in the client to a well-defined event and receiving the event from the client. This would have advantageously reduced downtime, and would have further provided an effective means for facilitating event communication among networks, Touboul, col. 3, line 66-col. 4, line 30, Coley, col. 4, line 60 through col. 5, line 2.

17. In considering claims 237, 295, and 353, Coley teaches the event being received through an application program interface. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

18. In considering claims 238, 296, and 354, Coley teaches transmitting the well-defined event to a server before obtaining the event handling script. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

19. In considering claims 239, 297, and 355, Coley teaches storing the well-defined event prior to processing. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

20. In considering claims 240, 298, and 356, Coley teaches the well-defined event being assigned a priority level in accordance with a pre-determined criterion. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

21. In considering claims 241, 299, and 357, Coley teaches the processing being performed in accordance with the priority level. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

22. In considering claims 243, 301, and 359, Coley teaches creating a workflow thread for the well-defined event. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

23. In considering claims 244, 302, and 360, Coley teaches the workflow thread processed in accordance with the event handling script. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

24. In considering claims 245, 303, and 361, Coley teaches a first well-defined event and a second well-defined event processed from separate working threads. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

25. In considering claims 246, 304, and 362, Coley teaches the first well-defined event dependent, or not dependent, on the second well-defined event to finish

processing, or to change a state of a property. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

26. In considering claims 247, 305, and 363, Coley teaches the well-defined event being divided into a plurality of workflow threads that are processed simultaneously or independent of each other. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

27. In considering claims 248, 306, and 364, Coley teaches receiving instructions to configure the event handling script. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

28. In considering claims 249, 307, and 365, Coley teaches the instructions being received from a customized component. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

29. In considering claims 250, 308, and 366, Coley teaches the customized component handling and displaying a notification. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

30. In considering claims 251, 309, and 367, Coley teaches the customized component displaying information defined by an event handling script. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

31. In considering claims 252, 310, and 368, Coley teaches accessing a directory service for accessing information and operational preferences. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

32. In considering claims 253, 311, and 369, Coley teaches embedding state information into a persistent store for the well-defined event. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

33. In considering claims 254, 312, and 370, Coley teaches providing a notification service, the notification service allowing access to a notification dispatcher for transmitting a notification. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

34. In considering claims 255, 313, and 371, Coley teaches the notification dispatcher providing access to at least one mechanism of notification, the notification provided as a result of the processing. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

35. In considering claims 256, 314, and 372, Coley teaches the mechanism of notification being one of electronic mail, paging, web browsing and instant messaging. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

36. In considering claims 257, 315, and 373, Coley teaches transmitting a notification as a result of the processing. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

37. In considering claims 258, 316, and 374, Coley teaches the event handling script provided as an executable script. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

38. In considering claims 259, 317, and 375, Coley teaches timers that specify the time a well-defined event is processed by an event handling script. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

39. In considering claims 260, 318, and 376, Coley teaches the event performed in accordance with a time sequence required by the event handling script. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

40. In considering claims 261, 319, and 377, Coley teaches transmitting information based on the processing of the well-defined event through an application

program interface to users. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67,

and col. 10, lines 1-56.

41. In considering claims 263, 321, and 379, Coley teaches dispatching a

notification based upon the processing of the well-defined event. See col. 3, lines 9-67,

col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

42. In considering claims 264, 322, and 380, Coley teaches accessing a

repository for querying and publishing information between at least two of the plurality of

systems. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines

1-56.

43. In considering claims 265, 323, and 381, Coley teaches the repository

providing information for one of, defining, handling and processing well-defined events

in the systems. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10,

lines 1-56.

44. In considering claims 266, 324, and 382, Coley teaches the repository

providing information to assist in discovery of information on a potential counter-party.

See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

45. In considering claims 267, 325, and 383, Coley teaches listening for determining presence of a well-defined event at the server. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

46. In considering claims 268, 326, and 384, Coley teaches the server being a distributed server. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

47. In considering claims 269, 327, and 385, Coley teaches synchronizing a result of processing the well-defined event received in the distributed server. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

48. In considering claims 270, 328, and 386, Coley teaches loading a handling script for processing a subsection of the well-defined event. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

49. In considering claims 271, 329, and 387, Coley teaches saving the well-defined event received at the server in a storage device. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

50. In considering claims 272, 330, and 388, Coley teaches the mechanism of dispatching the notification being one of electronic mail, paging, web browsing, and

instant messaging. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

51. In considering claims 273, 331, and 389, Coley teaches dispatching the notification to the client. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

52. In considering claims 274, 332, and 390, Coley teaches the well-defined event processed in a workflow thread. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

53. In considering claims 275, 333, and 391, Coley teaches the workflow thread processed in accordance with the event handling script. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

54. In considering claims 276, 334, and 392, Coley teaches a first and second well-defined event processed from separate working threads. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

55. In considering claims 277, 335, and 393, Coley teaches the first well-defined event dependent, or not dependent, on the second well-defined event to finish

processing, or the change a state of property. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

56. In considering claims 278, 336, and 394, Coley teaches the well-defined event divided into a plurality of workflow threads that are processed simultaneously or independent of each other. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

57. In considering claims 279, 337, and 395, Coley teaches writing a customized service accessible to the event handling script. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

58. In considering claims 280, 338, and 396, Coley teaches the event handling script configured to use system service during the processing. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

59. In considering claims 281, 339, and 397, Coley teaches the handling script configured to use customized service during the processing. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

60. In considering claims 282, 340, and 398, Coley teaches the system service providing access to a repository that facilitates querying and publishing of information. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

61. In considering claims 283, 341, and 399, Coley teaches the information assisting the systems in managing connectivity there between. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

62. In considering claims 284, 342, and 400, Coley teaches the system service causing the event handling script to embed state information into a persistent storage means for allowing the well-defined event to check state across more than one processing path. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

63. In considering claims 285, 343, and 401, Coley teaches the system service providing the event handling script with access to a schedule to determine flow of processing of the well-defined event. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

64. In considering claims 286, 344, and 402, Coley teaches the system service allowing the event handling script to write messages to an action log of the well-defined

event and to a storage device. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

65. In considering claims 287, 345, and 403, Coley teaches the system service allowing the event handling script to create timers that specify the time a well-defined event is processed. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

66. In considering claims 288, 346, and 404, Coley teaches the system service allowing the event handling script to create a time sequence by which the well-defined event is processed. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

67. In considering claims 289, 347, and 405, Coley teaches assigning a priority level to the well-defined event in accordance with a pre-determined criterion. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

68. In considering claims 290, 348, and 406, Coley teaches scheduling the well-defined event in accordance with the priority level. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

69. In considering claims 291, 349, and 407, Coley teaches the processing performed in accordance with the priority level. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

70. In considering claims 292, 350, and 408, Coley teaches the event handling script provided as an executable script. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

71. In considering claim 412, Coley teaches a, system for facilitating event communication among networks having a plurality of systems comprising: A server; an agent resident on one of the plurality of networks, wherein the agent communicates with the server, and a monitor coupled to the agent, wherein the monitor handles and displays notifications and enables event handling in the agent, wherein the server further acts as a message router for forwarding events between one or more agents, the agent providing the server with connectivity information, the server further persisting events and event actions that flow through the system, (col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56; also see Fig. 1).

Although the teachings of Coley show substantial features of the claimed invention, they fail to expressly disclose: determining a priority for a received event.

Nevertheless, Coley does teach correlating a plurality of events within a data processing system that evaluates the plurality of events with respect to a predetermined rule to determine an action to be performed, (col. 2, lines 2-9). Furthermore,

determining a priority for a received event was well known in the art at the time of the present invention. This is exemplified in the teachings of Kung. In a similar field of endeavor Kung teaches an expert system for a communications network comprising: a workflow manager for determining a priority for a received event, (col. 4, line 60 through col. 5, line 2).

Thus, if not implicit in the teachings of Coley, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to modify the teachings of Coley to show the server comprising a workflow manager for determining a priority for a received event. This would have ensured an efficient means for handling received events in an order of importance, Coley, col. 4, line 60 through col. 5, line 2.

Although the modified teachings of Coley show substantial features of the claimed invention, they further fail to expressly disclose: receiving the well-defined event from the agent.

Nevertheless, Coley does teach converting the event in a server to a well-defined event, (col. 4, lines 31-33, col. 8, lines 32-36). Furthermore, it was well known in the art at the time of the present invention that a server could also function as an agent, and functionality found in a server could also be implemented in an agent. In a similar field of endeavor, Touboul teaches a method and apparatus for monitoring and controlling programs in a network comprising: converting an event in an agent (14) to a well-defined event, and receiving the event in a management console from the agent, (col. 4, lines 49-67, also see Fig. 1).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to further modify the teachings of Coley to show receiving the event from the agent. This would have advantageously reduced downtime, and would have further provided an effective means for facilitating event communication among networks, Touboul, col. 3, line 66-col. 4, line 30, Coley, col. 4, line 60 through col. 5, line 2.

72. In considering claim 413, Coley teaches the server comprising: a server event manager for continuously discovering a well-defined event entering the server; a server workflow engine for processing the well-defined event received by the server; a server workflow manager for controlling and overseeing the processing of the well-defined event by the workflow engine; a server state manager for maintaining state of the well-defined event across the server; and a notification dispatcher for transmitting information of the well-defined event through delivery means to at least one user. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

73. In considering claim 414, Coley teaches the server workflow engine further comprising: at least one server workflow thread for allowing division of workflow into a smaller task, wherein the task can be performed independently; and a script engine for providing scripted processing of well-defined events and actions within the server workflow engine. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

74. In considering claim 415, Coley teaches the server comprising an application program interface for communicating with various messaging protocols. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

75. In considering claim 416, Coley teaches the application program interface allowing interaction with client systems. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

76. In considering claim 417, Coley teaches the server further comprising a security manager for ensuring that information passed to the server is reliable. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

77. In considering claim 418, Coley teaches the server comprising a storage device for saving the well-defined event. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

78. In considering claim 419, Coley teaches the server comprising a repository for storing information to define, handle and process the well-defined event. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

79. In considering claim 420, Coley teaches the agent comprising: an agent event manager for detecting an event entering the agent; an agent workflow engine for processing the event received within the agent; an agent workflow manager for controlling and overseeing the processing of the event by the workflow engine; an agent state manager for maintaining state of the event across the agent; and a notification dispatcher for transmitting information of the event through delivery means to at least one user. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

80. In considering claim 421, Coley teaches the agent comprising: an event application program interface for interfacing with external engines to receive events addressed to the agent. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

81. In considering claim 422, Coley teaches the agent comprising: a connection manager for managing connections to the agent. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

82. In considering claim 423, Coley teaches the agent workflow engine comprising: at least one agent workflow thread for allowing division of workflow into a smaller task, wherein the task can be performed independently; and a script engine for

providing scripted processing of events and actions within the agent workflow engine.
See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

83. In considering claim 424, Coley teaches the agent comprising: an application
program interface for communicating with various messaging protocols. See col. 3,
lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

84. In considering claim 425, Coley teaches the application program interface
allowing interaction with client systems. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9,
lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

85. In considering claim 426, Coley teaches the monitor displaying notifications
regarding the events. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and
col. 10, lines 1-56.

86. In considering claim 427, Coley teaches the monitor allowing modification of
customized rules for event handling. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9,
lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

87. In considering claim 428, Coley teaches the monitor capable of being viewed
from a standard web browser. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-
67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

88. In considering claim 429, Coley teaches the monitor capable of being viewed from a customized application. See col. 3, lines 9-67, col. 4, lines 1-50, col. 9, lines 21-67, and col. 10, lines 1-56.

Conclusion

89. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hassan Phillips whose telephone number is (571) 272-3940. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on (571) 272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

HP/
10/12/05

ZARNI MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAM'